COMMON AIMS AND ELEMENTS

Despite the broad range of geographical distribution and programmatic variations, it is possible to draw a composite picture of the demonstration programs since they all share basic objectives and have certain elements in common, such as: 1) The auxiliary-participants in all projects were selected wholly or in large measure from those at or below the poverty level; 2) Every program combined theoretical instruction with learning through experience in a practicum or regular school classroom; 3) All projects were committed to experiment with auxiliaries in new functions which were directly related to the learningteaching process rather than functions which were indirectly related to instruction, such as simple clerical tasks: 4) There was pre-planning with the local school systems in every case so as to assure employment for the auxiliaries who satisfactorily completed the training program, and to gear the training to the needs of the school system (though not to lose the vitality and growth components in this recognition of reality requirements); 5) Every project had a research director on its staff and included a component of self-evaluation in its program; 6) All were funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and were coordinated under the Bank Street College of Education Study of Auxiliary Personnel in Education.

These mutual elements were requirements for funding by the O.E.O. in this matrix of demonstration training projects. At work conferences for project directors convened by Bank Street College of Education, these common elements were fused into one basic purpose, which undergirded their diverse but cooperative activities, i.e.

"To formulate hypotheses as to principle and practices which appear to be effective in actual practice for the:

1. role definition and development:

2. training;

3. institutionalization of auxiliary personnel as part of the learning-

teaching process."

To develop the role of the auxiliary as an integral and contributive factor in American education required an understanding of the whole complex of roles, responsibilities, and relationships involved in the learning-teaching process. Consequently, in the Work Conference for Directors, prior to the completion of project proposals, there was consensus that teachers and administrators had a great deal to learn as well as to give in these training programs. In nine of the 15 programs, therefore, teachers were enrolled as participants to work with auxiliaries in the classroom; to explore role possibilities not only for auxiliaries but also for themselves, in terms of new and more complex professional roles in an aided teaching situation; to evaluate their experiences; and to plan for more effective utilization of auxiliaries in the future. In the projects where there was dual participation (teachers and auxiliaries), role development was facilitated, in the opinion of staff and participants alike.

The principal dilemma appeared to be the conflict between role definition which was recognized as necessary to institutionalization, and role development which was a dynamic of each classroom situation where auxiliaries were utilized. The degree of responsibility assigned to an auxiliary is dependent upon the interaction of a particular teacher and a particular auxiliary operating within a given structure and responding to the special needs of individual pupils. A delicate balance seems to be required in order to provide the specificity that means security along

with the flexibility that promotes growth.

In those six 2 projects in which there was a component of group counseling for participants built into the program, there appeared to be far less fear on the part of teacher-participants that standards were threatened by the introduction of non-certified personnel into the classroom. In counseling sessions, teachers tended to recognize and understand their feelings of being somewhat threatened by the presence of another adult in the classroom, and to begin to develop some inner strength to cope with this insecurity.

In some programs, administrators also attended as learners and planners for at least a portion of the training—a significant addition not only to the training program, but to ultimate institutionalization.

² Berkeley, Howard, Jackson, Maine, Puerto Rico, and Riverside.